

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated July 25, 2007 (hereafter "Office Action"), claims 1, 3, 9, 14 and 15 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification and claims as filed. Accordingly, the amendments do not constitute the addition of new matter.

Claims 2, 4 and 16 have been cancelled without prejudice. As a result, claims 1, 3, 5-15, and 17-18 remain pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 9 and 14 are independent. Reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and following comments is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-15, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Yanagisawa et al. (USPN: 6,621,489) in view of Cho (USPN: 6,081,902) and further in view of Lee et al. (USPN 7,109,965). Applicant respectfully traverses the prior art rejections, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), for at least the reason that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

(c. all claims limitations must be taught)

To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, **all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.** *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). **"All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art."** *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). **If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious.** *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). (MPEP §2143.03 All Claim Limitations Must Be Taught or Suggested)

Independent claims 1, 9 and 14 define a method for reducing the residual image effect of a liquid crystal display after turned off and a related system. In these independent claims 1, 9 and 14, a plurality of thin film transistors on the liquid crystal display are turned on after turning off the image data transmission and before turning off the power of the liquid crystal display (i.e. a power to the liquid crystal display is turned off after turning on the thin film transistors) to discharge residual charges.

With particular reference to Lee, Applicant submits that Lee fails to teach or suggest the same timing of when the thin film transistors are turned on (i.e., *after* turning off the image data transmission and *before* turning off the power of the liquid crystal display) as that set forth in Applicant's independent claims 1, 9 and 14. In contrast, Lee merely discloses that the TFT should be turned on when a power source of the liquid crystal display panel is turned off (See, col. 10, line 63-col. 11, line 5 of Lee). This can be better understood with reference to FIG. 8 of Lee. FIG. 8 of Lee shows the gate low voltage Vgl rises to higher than the ground level GND to turn on the TFT after turning off the power source of the liquid crystal display panel. However, in independent claims 1, 9 and 14, the thin film transistors on the liquid crystal display is turned on after turning off the image data transmission and before turning off the power of the liquid crystal display.

Moreover, with respect to the remaining Yanagisawa and Cho references, the Examiner admits, at page 4 of the Office Action, that Yanagisawa and Cho fail to teach or suggest, "turning on a plurality of thin film transistors on the liquid crystal display after turning off the image data transmission", as required by Applicant's claims 1, 9, and 14. Furthermore, the Yanagisawa and Cho references also fail to teach or suggest, "turning on a plurality of thin film transistors on the liquid crystal display before turning off the power of

the liquid crystal display", also as required by Applicant's claims 1, 9 and 14. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant submits that none of the asserted references, whether taken alone or in reasonable combination, teach or suggest the claimed combination of elements recited by amended claims 1, 9, and 14. As such, claims 1, 9, and 14 are clearly patentable. And, because claims 3, 5-8, 10-13, 15, and 17-18 depend from one of claims 1, 9, or 14, either directly or indirectly, these claims are patentable at least by virtue of dependency as well as for their additional recitations. Accordingly, the immediate withdrawal of the prior art rejections of claims 1, 3, 5-15, and 17-18 is respectfully requested.

Other cited references of record have been studied, and are found no more relevant to the present invention than the applied art.

All claims in the present application are now in condition for allowance. Early and favorable indication of allowance is courteously solicited.

Conclusion

All matters having been addressed and in view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the immediate allowance of all pending claims.

Applicant's Counsel remains ready to assist the Examiner in any way to facilitate and expedite the prosecution of this matter. If any point remains in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the Undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number **03-3975**. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**PILLSBURY WINTHROP
SHAW PITTMAN LLP**



E. R. HERNANDEZ
Reg. No. 47641
Tel. No. 703.770.7788
Fax No. 703.770.7901

Date: October 25, 2007
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 770-7900